

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 212

July 23, 1996, 9:35 am
Page S-July 23, 1996, 9:35 am Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM RECONCILIATION/SSI Recruitment

SUBJECT: Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 . . . S. 1956. Domenici motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the Faircloth amendment No. 4905.

ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 41-57

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1956, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996, will enact major welfare reforms. The Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program will be replaced with a new Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant to the States. The TANF block grant will be capped through 2001. Time limits will be placed on individuals receiving TANF benefits. Overall, the growth in non-Medicaid welfare spending will be slowed to 4.3 percent annually. The bill originally included major Medicaid reforms, but most of those provisions were stricken when the bill was reported. Without those Medicaid reforms, welfare spending will still be reduced by \$61.4 billion over 6 years.

The Faircloth amendment would add that nothing in this bill would be construed as authorizing recruitment activities under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Program, including with respect to outreach projects.

Following debate, Senator Exon raised a point of order that the amendment violated section 305 of the Budget Act. Senator Domenici then moved to waive that section for the consideration of the Faircloth amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to waive favored the amendment; those opposing the motion to waive opposed the amendment.

NOTE: A three-fifths majority (60) vote is required to waive section 305 of the Budget Act. Following the vote, the point of order was upheld and the amendment thus fell.

Those favoring the motion to waive contended:

SSI is the fastest growing welfare program in America. One reason why is that the bureaucrats who run it go to great lengths to sign up as many people as they can. Through mailings, newspaper advertising, and even by hiring welfare advocacy groups to make door-to-door solicitations, they go out of their way to find people to apply for benefits. They have found a lot of people. For instance,

(See other side)

YEAS (41)			NAYS (57)			NOT VOTING (2)	
Republicans (40 or 77%)	Democrats (1 or 2%)		Republicans (12 or 23%)	Democrats (45 or 98%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Byrd	Bennett	Akaka	Johnston	Kassebaum- ⁴	Inouye- ²
Ashcroft	Inhofe		Bond	Baucus	Kennedy		
Brown	Kempthorne		Campbell	Biden	Kerrey		
Burns	Kyl		Chafee	Bingaman	Kerry		
Coats	Lott		Cohen	Boxer	Kohl		
Cochran	Mack		Hatch	Bradley	Lautenberg		
Coverdell	McCain		Hatfield	Breaux	Leahy		
Craig	McConnell		Jeffords	Bryan	Levin		
D'Amato	Murkowski		Lugar	Bumpers	Lieberman		
DeWine	Nickles		Snowe	Conrad	Mikulski		
Domenici	Pressler		Specter	Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Faircloth	Roth		Stevens	Dodd	Moynihan		
Frahm	Santorum			Dorgan	Murray		
Frist	Shelby			Exon	Nunn		
Gorton	Simpson			Feingold	Pell		
Gramm	Smith			Feinstein	Pryor		
Grams	Thomas			Ford	Reid		
Grassley	Thompson			Glenn	Robb		
Gregg	Thurmond			Graham	Rockefeller		
Helms	Warner			Harkin	Sarbanes		
				Heflin	Simon		
				Hollings	Wellstone		
					Wyden		

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

over the past 10 years, payments for disabled children under the SSI program have gone up 400 percent, and over the past 15 years they have gone up over 825 percent for immigrants. Many of those people, by traditional standards, are not really disabled, and they got along just fine before welfare pushers showed up at their doors telling them what forms to fill out, and how to word them, in order to qualify for SSI welfare checks. Nothing in the amendment would prohibit Health and Human Services from making brochures or providing any information on how the program works on request. It would only stop active recruitment of the "free cash, come-and-get-it" type that is making the SSI program the fastest growing Federal welfare program. This amendment is clearly meritorious; we urge our colleagues to waive the Budget Act for its consideration.

Those opposing the motion to waive contended:

We tend to agree that door-to-door solicitations should not be permitted to find new SSI recipients, but we see nothing wrong in general with informing the general public that the SSI program exists, just as we see nothing wrong with spreading information about any other Federal program. For instance, it is perfectly appropriate for the Farmers Home Administration to send information to farmers, telling them about its programs and inviting them to participate if they qualify. Frankly, if the Federal Government were not able to engage in any type of advertising for any of its programs the effectiveness of those programs would be seriously weakened because few people would know that they existed, and thus would not participate. Their needs would not be met. In this particular case, the effectiveness would be especially weakened because the beneficiaries are disabled, and are thus less able to seek out the services they need. If the Faircloth amendment simply curbed the SSI recruitment excesses to make it operate like other Federal programs, we could support it, but as it is worded it is too extreme and we must therefore vote against it.